Are confidence intervals inference?

Suppose we have a scalar parameter θ, a random variable X with unknown distribution $\mathbb{P}(\cdot)$, and an interval-valued function $x \mapsto C(x)$ such that, no matter the distribution of X, we know that

$$\mathbb{P}(\theta \in C(X)) = 0.9.$$

The interval $C(\cdot)$ is a *valid confidence interval* for θ. This means that if we act as if $\theta \in C(X)$, we will be wrong at most 10% of the time.

Are confidence intervals inference?

Suppose we have a scalar parameter θ, a random variable X with unknown distribution $\mathbb{P}(\cdot)$, and an interval-valued function $x \mapsto C(x)$ such that, no matter the distribution of X, we know that

$$\mathbb{P}(\theta \in C(X)) = 0.9.$$

The interval $C(\cdot)$ is a *valid confidence interval* for θ. This means that if we act as if $\theta \in C(X)$, we will be wrong at most 10% of the time.

When is it reasonable to interpret $C(\cdot)$ *inferentially*, saying that, when we observe $X = x$, that we subjectively believe that $\theta \in C(x)$ with 90% certainty?

Write beliefs as $\mathbb{B}(\theta \in C(x) | X = x) = 0.9$, to contrast with aleatoric probabiliites $\mathbb{P}()$. So we want to know when

$$\mathbb{P}(\theta \in C(X)) = 0.9 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \mathbb{B}(\theta \in C(x) | X = x) = 0.9$$

A pathological confidence interval

We want to know when

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\theta \in C(X)\right) = 0.9 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \mathbb{B}\left(\theta \in C(x) | X = x\right) = 0.9$$

This is not trivial!

A pathological confidence interval

We want to know when

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\theta \in C(X)\right) = 0.9 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \mathbb{B}\left(\theta \in C(x) | X = x\right) = 0.9$$

This is not trivial!

Recall, for example, how we can construct silly confidence intervals. Augment the data with a draw $Z \sim \mathrm{Unif}(0, 1)$, and let

$$C(x) = \begin{cases} (-\infty, \infty) & \text{when } z \leq 0.9 \\ [1337, 1337] & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

Obviously, no matter what the generating process, $\mathbb{P}\left(\theta \in C(X)\right) = 0.9$, but it is absurd to assert that $\mathbb{B}\left(\theta \in C(x) | Z = 0.95\right) = 0.9$.

A pathological confidence interval

We want to know when

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\theta \in C(X)\right) = 0.9 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \mathbb{B}\left(\theta \in C(x) | X = x\right) = 0.9$$

This is not trivial!

Recall, for example, how we can construct silly confidence intervals. Augment the data with a draw $Z \sim \mathrm{Unif}(0, 1)$, and let

$$C(x) = \begin{cases} (-\infty, \infty) & \text{when } z \leq 0.9 \\ [1337, 1337] & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

Obviously, no matter what the generating process, $\mathbb{P}\left(\theta \in C(X)\right) = 0.9$, but it is absurd to assert that $\mathbb{B}\left(\theta \in C(x) | Z = 0.95\right) = 0.9$.

How can we characterize precisely what went wrong?

Bayes is sufficient, but is it necessary?

Note that Bayesians define priors and completely specified data generating processes and insist that $\mathbb{B}() = \mathbb{P}()$.

Certainly that suffices. But is it necessary?

Bayes is sufficient, but is it necessary?

Note that Bayesians define priors and completely specified data generating processes and insist that $\mathbb{B}() = \mathbb{P}()$.

Certainly that suffices. But is it necessary?

It is often difficult to plausibly specify everything needed for Bayes. In such cases it can be hard to assert that $\mathbb{B}() = \mathbb{P}()$.

Bayes is sufficient, but is it necessary?

Note that Bayesians define priors and completely specified data generating processes and insist that $\mathbb{B}() = \mathbb{P}()$.

Certainly that suffices. But is it necessary?

It is often difficult to plausibly specify everything needed for Bayes. In such cases it can be hard to assert that $\mathbb{B}() = \mathbb{P}()$.

We may also want to trade off mathematical or computational effort to achieve $\mathbb{B}() \approx \mathbb{P}()$. Bayes gives no real guidance for doing so.

Bayes is sufficient, but is it necessary?

Note that Bayesians define priors and completely specified data generating processes and insist that $\mathbb{B}() = \mathbb{P}()$.

Certainly that suffices. But is it necessary?

It is often difficult to plausibly specify everything needed for Bayes. In such cases it can be hard to assert that $\mathbb{B}() = \mathbb{P}()$.

We may also want to trade off mathematical or computational effort to achieve $\mathbb{B}() \approx \mathbb{P}()$. Bayes gives no real guidance for doing so.

I argue that potential answers may be found in the (nowadays largely discarded) approaches of *fiducial inference*.

Here, I will follow the treatment from Ian Hacking's book, *The Logic of Statisical Inference*.

Fiducial inference for confidence intervals

Fiducial inference for confidence intervals requires three key assumptions. The first two are uncontroversial:

The logic of support: Formally, $\mathbb{B}()$ obeys Kolmogorov's axioms. For example, if proposition A and B are mutually incompatible, then $\mathbb{B}(A|B) = 0$. If B provides no information about A, then $\mathbb{B}(A|B) = \mathbb{B}(A)$. If $B \Rightarrow A$, then $\mathbb{B}(A|B) = 1$. And so on.

The logic of support is needed to even write and manipulate $\mathbb{B}(\cdot)$.

Fiducial inference for confidence intervals

Fiducial inference for confidence intervals requires three key assumptions. The first two are uncontroversial:

The logic of support: Formally, $\mathbb{B}()$ obeys Kolmogorov's axioms. For example, if proposition A and B are mutually incompatible, then $\mathbb{B}(A|B) = 0$. If B provides no information about A, then $\mathbb{B}(A|B) = \mathbb{B}(A)$. If $B \Rightarrow A$, then $\mathbb{B}(A|B) = 1$. And so on.

The logic of support is needed to even write and manipulate $\mathbb{B}(\cdot)$.

The frequency principle: If $\mathbb{P}(X)$ is known, then our subjective beliefs correspond with aleatoric probabilities. That is, $\mathbb{B}(X = x) = \mathbb{P}(X = x)$.

Fiducial inference for confidence intervals

Fiducial inference for confidence intervals requires three key assumptions. The first two are uncontroversial:

The logic of support: Formally, $\mathbb{B}\left(\right)$ obeys Kolmogorov's axioms. For example, if proposition A and B are mutually incompatible, then $\mathbb{B}\left(A|B\right) = 0$. If B provides no information about A, then $\mathbb{B}\left(A|B\right) = \mathbb{B}\left(A\right)$. If $B \Rightarrow A$, then $\mathbb{B}\left(A|B\right) = 1$. And so on.

The logic of support is needed to even write and manipulate $\mathbb{B}\left(\cdot\right)$.

The frequency principle: If $\mathbb{P}\left(X\right)$ is known, then our subjective beliefs correspond with aleatoric probabilities. That is, $\mathbb{B}\left(X = x\right) = \mathbb{P}\left(X = x\right)$.

The third is where things can go wrong for confidence intervals.

Irrelevance: The precise value of the data $X = x$ is not subjectively informative about whether $\theta \in C(x)$. That is,

$$\mathbb{B}\left(\theta \in C(x)|X = x\right) = \mathbb{B}\left(\theta \in C(x)\right).$$

Fiducial inference for confidence intervals

Fiducial inference for confidence intervals requires three key assumptions. The first two are uncontroversial:

The logic of support: Formally, $\mathbb{B}\left(\right)$ obeys Kolmogorov's axioms. For example, if proposition A and B are mutually incompatible, then $\mathbb{B}\left(A|B\right) = 0$. If B provides no information about A, then $\mathbb{B}\left(A|B\right) = \mathbb{B}\left(A\right)$. If $B \Rightarrow A$, then $\mathbb{B}\left(A|B\right) = 1$. And so on.

The logic of support is needed to even write and manipulate $\mathbb{B}\left(\cdot\right)$.

The frequency principle: If $\mathbb{P}\left(X\right)$ is known, then our subjective beliefs correspond with aleatoric probabilities. That is, $\mathbb{B}\left(X = x\right) = \mathbb{P}\left(X = x\right)$.

The third is where things can go wrong for confidence intervals.

Irrelevance: The precise value of the data $X = x$ is not subjectively informative about whether $\theta \in C(x)$. That is,

$$\mathbb{B}\left(\theta \in C(x)|X = x\right) = \mathbb{B}\left(\theta \in C(x)\right).$$

Using these three assumptions, confidence intervals are valid inference:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{B}\left(\theta \in C(x)|X = x\right) &= \mathbb{B}\left(\theta \in C(x)\right) && \text{Irrelevance} \\
&= \mathbb{P}\left(\theta \in C(X)\right) && \text{The frequency principle} \\
&= 0.9 && \text{Construction of } C(\cdot).
\end{aligned}$$

The pathological example is caught

Irrelevance: The precise value of the data $X = x$ is not subjectively informative about whether $\theta \in C(x)$. That is,

$$\mathbb{B}\left(\theta \in C(x) | X = x\right) = \mathbb{B}\left(\theta \in C(x)\right).$$

Recall our pathological example:

$$C(x) = \begin{cases} (-\infty, \infty) & \text{when } z \leq 0.9 \\ [1337, 1337] & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

Our pathological example fails the principle of irrelevance, since knowing $z \geq 0.9$ is very informative about whether $\theta \in C(x)$.

How to use this?

The *invalidity* of a confidence interval can be demonstrated by an ability to predict $\mathbb{I}(\theta \in C(x))$ from x.

How to use this?

The *invalidity* of a confidence interval can be demonstrated by an ability to predict $\mathbb{I}(\theta \in C(x))$ from x.

Given a candidate confidence interval, constructed using any method, this renders the validity of inference *quantitatively falisifiable*, e.g. through simulation and machine learning.

How to use this?

The *invalidity* of a confidence interval can be demonstrated by an ability to predict $\mathbb{I}(\theta \in C(x))$ from x.

Given a candidate confidence interval, constructed using any method, this renders the validity of inference *quantitatively falisifiable*, e.g. through simulation and machine learning.

It also admits *degrees of valid inference*, e.g. in the sense that $\mathbb{I}(\theta \in C(x))$ may be only slightly predictd by x.

How to use this?

The *invalidity* of a confidence interval can be demonstrated by an ability to predict $\mathbb{I}(\theta \in C(x))$ from x.

Given a candidate confidence interval, constructed using any method, this renders the validity of inference *quantitatively falisifiable*, e.g. through simulation and machine learning.

It also admits *degrees of valid inference*, e.g. in the sense that $\mathbb{I}(\theta \in C(x))$ may be only slightly predictd by x.

Computation of $C(x)$ and predictability of $\mathbb{I}(\theta \in C(x))$ can in principle be explicitly traded off against one another.

How to use this?

The *invalidity* of a confidence interval can be demonstrated by an ability to predict $\mathbb{I}(\theta \in C(x))$ from x.

Given a candidate confidence interval, constructed using any method, this renders the validity of inference *quantitatively falisifiable*, e.g. through simulation and machine learning.

It also admits *degrees of valid inference*, e.g. in the sense that $\mathbb{I}(\theta \in C(x))$ may be only slightly predictd by x.

Computation of $C(x)$ and predictability of $\mathbb{I}(\theta \in C(x))$ can in principle be explicitly traded off against one another.

I think this is very exciting.